

## **REMARKS**

Claims 17, 18, 19, 23 and 29 have been amended. Claims 22 and 31-37 have been cancelled. Claims 38-45 are new. Claims 17-21, 23-29 and 38-33 remain pending in the application. Support for the amendments may be found at least at paragraphs [0083] and [121]-[0141] of Applicants specification. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Section 103(a) Rejection:**

The Final Office Action mailed January 7, 2010 (hereinafter “the Office Action”) rejected claims 17-29 and 31-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,684,369) (hereinafter “Bernardo”) in view of Ackermann, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 6,606,653) (hereinafter “Ackermann”) and further in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,578,078) (hereinafter “Smith”). Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

As amended, independent claim 17 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

- combining the document template and the content data to generate a document in a first context, wherein the document comprises a relative uniform resource locator (URL) that is relative to a first site base associated with the first context of the document;

- receiving a request to publish the document to a second context associated with a second site base;

- modifying the relative URL such that it is relative to the second site base associated with the second context; and

- publishing the document, including the modified relative URL, to the second context.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of features recited above is allowable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Bernardo relates to a software tool for use with a computer system to simplify the creation of Web sites. (Bernardo, abstract). Bernardo discloses that tools may include a library of templates (e.g., text, fields, HTML code and formulas) that correspond to available features and options. (Bernardo, col. 6, lines 32-61). The templates comprise databases which may include fields, forms, views, text, formulas and profiles that enable customization of the features, such as a list of site areas. *Id.* One area may be “Company Information”, and a template corresponding to this feature may include certain text and HTML formatting components for a Web page for this area, with fields for company name, address, contact person, etc. *Id.* Accordingly, Bernardo discloses a website template including an area for a list of sites including fields of information (e.g., company name, address, contact person, etc.), although the cited portions of Bernardo do not disclose that the site area includes links (e.g., URL’s) to other web pages or resources.

Ackerman relates to upgrading embedded links or hotspots in source Web pages to reflect the new Universal Resource Locations (URLs) of moved target Web Pages. (Ackerman, abstract). Ackerman discloses the target page at the new location transmits to the source page, the new URL of the moved target Web page and the embedded link in the source page is upgraded to include the new URL. (Ackerman, col. 6, lines 41-45). Thus, Ackerman discloses updating an embedded link in the source page to reflect movement of a separate target web page to a new location. Neither Bernardo nor Ackerman, discloses a document in a first context that includes a URL, modifying the URL in the document to correspond to a second context, and publishing the modified the document including the modified URL to a second location, much less where the URL includes a relative URL that is relative to a first site base associated with the first context of the document, and where modifying includes modifying the relative URL such that it is relative to the second site base associated with the second context.

Smith does not remedy this deficiency. Smith merely states that a relative URL does not include a protocol identifier, machine name or port, and must be interpreted relative to some known absolute URL called the base URL. (Smith, col. 4, lines 42-45).

Accordingly, the cited art does not appear to teach or suggests at least the features of, “combining the document template and the content data to generate a document in a first context, wherein the document comprises a relative uniform resource locator (URL) that is relative to a first site base associated with the first context of the document; receiving a request to publish the document to a second context associated with a second site base; modifying the relative URL such that it is relative to the second site base associated with the second context; and publishing the document, including the modified relative URL, to the second context,” in combination with other features of the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

As amended, independent claim 29 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

- publishing the web page document to an editing context for previewing the web page document prior to publishing the document;

- receiving a request to publish the web page document to a viewing context for viewing the web page document; and

- in response to receiving the request to publish the web page document:

- determining that the web page document comprises a relative URL that is relative to a site base associated with the editing context;

- modifying the relative URL such that it is relative to a site base associated with the viewing context; and

- publishing the web page document, including the modified relative URL, to the viewing context.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above. Moreover, the cited art does not appear to tech or suggests “an editing context for previewing the web page document prior to publishing

the document” and “a viewing context for viewing the web page document,” in combination with other features of the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is allowable over the cited art.

New independent claim 38 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

generating a document in a first context, wherein the document comprises a plurality of uniform resource locators (URLs), wherein at least one of the URLs comprises a relative URL that is relative to a site base associated with the first context, and wherein at least one of the URLs comprises a relative URL that is relative to a site base associated with the a second context;

receiving a request to publish the document to the second context;  
and

in response to receiving the request to publish the document to the second context:

determining that a first URL of the plurality of URLs comprises a first relative URL that is relative to a site base associated with the first context;

determining that a second URL of the plurality of URLs comprises a second relative URL that is relative to a site base associated with the second context;

modifying the first URL such that it is relative to a site base associated with the second context;

not modifying the second URL; and

publishing the document, including the modified first URL, to the second context.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 38 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

Applicants further submit that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. Since the rejections have been shown to

be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. In any event, Applicants provide the following examples.

New claim 44 recites: “The method of claim 17, wherein the document comprises a plurality of URLs, wherein at least one of the URLs comprises a first relative URL type that is relative to a first site base associated with the first context, and wherein at least one of the URLs comprises a second relative URL type that is relative to a second site base associated with the second context; and further comprising, for each of the plurality of URLs, determining whether the URL needs to be modified based on the second context to publish the document to and a URL type of the respective URL.” The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 45 recites: “The method of claim 29, further comprising: determining that the web page comprises an other relative URL that is relative to a site base associated with the viewing context; and not modifying the other relative URL.” The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature, in combination with the other features of the claim.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6067-46200/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/  
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255  
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: May 7, 2010